

hssframework@cde.ca.gov

Instructional Quality Commission March 22, 2016

1430 N. Street, Suite 3207

Sacramento, CA 95814 hssframework@cde.ca.gov

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my strong objection to the edits suggested by the South Asia Faculty who have authored the recommended changes. I do this for two reasons, namely, (1) the mistaken and grossly misleading edits that fly in the face of the known history of India and South Asia and (2) the impact of these edits on the effective teaching of students at the desired grade levels. I address these issues, highlighted by specific cases, in the following comments.

It is important that the Commission understand, moreover, that my response is based on my professional background as one of the principal author of a prestigious historical atlas of India and South Asia that is accepted as the standard credential in the field, my numerous scholarly contributions over the last fifty years dealing with the history of India, and my continuing role in national efforts to support and endow chairs and programs for the teaching and research of the history and culture of India at the college and university level in the United States. With these facts in mind, I will briefly comment on the proposed edits.

In my view as a historian, the use of "South Asia" instead of India for all of Indian history is a mistaken backward projection of post-WWII terminology. The term South Asia has no historical association, nor does it recall the culture and heritage of any people. It is no more than a geographical area. Using "South Asia" instead of India effectively erases 5,000 years of vibrant culture and the identity of an entire ethnic group, presently 1/6th of the world's population. It is important that we not misconstrue what is in fact authentic historical analysis for a subterfuge that is a willful distortion of the essential historic and cultural character of India.

It also seems unfair that while China is part of "East Asia," its name is retained in the narrative, while only India is being removed. How is this explained? To follow the model promoted by the South Asia Faculty is to undermine the integrity of the general narrative and also opens the gates for faulty historical analysis of other regions and geo-cultural realities.

In regard to specific issues, *Sapta Sindhusu* is the Vedic name of the country, the region extending from the Ganga in the east to *Kubha* River (Kabul) river in the northwest of India (Hindushku mountains). where the Vedas were written as shown by the geography contained in the texts, which I have studied at great length. *Sindhusu* is found in the Avesta (the ancient Iranian scripture) as "*Hapta Hendu*" and in the Imperial Achaemenid Inscriptions as *Hindush*, by the Romans in Latin as "*Inde*". The Chinese in the 2nd Century BCE called India "*Yin-tu*" or "*Sen-tu*". Later, the Arabs and Iranians called India "*Al-Hind*". Thus, all these foreign

phonemes were, in fact, the transcriptions of "*Sapta Sindhusu*" or "*Sindhusu*", the Rig-Vedic designation of India.

I cannot agree with "Hinduism" being replaced with "religion of Ancient India" given the obvious continuity from ancient times to today of religious practice, culture, scripture, iconography, etc.

The use of "South Asia" creates a disconnect with the historical records, which refer only to "India." With Common Core emphasizing the use of original source material, why create this confusion?

The South Asia Faculty group refuses to even acknowledge the variety of opinions on various topics of Indian history, such as the supposed migration of "Aryans" into India in 1500 BCE, a migration unsupported by any indisputable evidence. This lack of understanding is puzzling and can only be explained by as a willful distortion for which no clear historical evidence is offered.

I find it especially troublesome that these scholars fail to explain how this term South Asia is of any help to a sixth grade student in understanding Indian or world history. Not only are the suggested edits blatantly misleading but I find them to be stSstso complicated and unclear as to be almost worthless from an educator's standpoint for the school grade levels for which they are targeted. It is of paramount importance that we neither mislead nor confuse our children in California with material that is almost impossible to digest and also difficult to explain as being historically accurate.

In conclusion, as both a scholar of Indian history and as an Indian, I find it truly offensive that the South Asian Faculty that have drafted these suggested edits are attempting to erase the very identity of India as a historical fact and a contemporary nation. By what authority do they speak? Only the nation of India has the right and the authority to change its national designation or to erase from the world map the very name of India. To adopt the suggested edits is an affront to India and to its diverse citizenry.

Respectfully,

Shiva G. Bajpai
Professor Emeritus of History
Former Director, Asian Studies
Department of History
California State University-Northridge 91330
Email: sbajpai@gmail.com